



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/337,916	06/22/1999	ARI J. HOURUNRANTA	442-008702-U	9673

7590 08/28/2002

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 064306232

EXAMINER

HOANG, THAI D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2662

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/337,916

Applicant(s)

HOURUNRANTA ET AL.

Examiner

Thai D Hoang

Art Unit

2662

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Application filed on June 22, 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claim 2, the specification does not clearly describe how the system detects an error location (payload, header) in the data packet for adding an estimation of the location of erroneous bytes to the error indication.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 9 and 11, the statements "missing segments", and "corrupted segments" are confusing, because the term "segments" can imply a part of data, part of a packet, part of a payload, or part of a header. It is not clear what is meant by "missing segments", and "corrupted segments."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, U.S. patent No. 6,310,897 in view of Lane, U.S. Patent No. 5,956,102.

Regarding claims 1, and 12-13, Watanabe discloses a method for encoding multiplexer/decoding demultiplexer information. Watanabe discloses that a multiplex signal comprising one or more data units, including a video data unit, and at least one framing data block in each multiplex signal, the framing data block carrying information on the configuration of the data units in the multiplex signal (fig. 1-5E); the method comprising: searching for framing data block from a received multiplex signal; demultiplexing one or more data units according to the information in the framing data block; generating one or more demultiplexed signals, including a video data signal, from the demultiplexed data units, forwarding the demultiplexed signals for decoding. Furthermore, Watanabe discloses that the method comprises the steps of: detecting at demultiplexing a possible invalidity of a demultiplexed video data unit and correcting error data correspond to the error (abstract; col. 2, line 55 - col.5, line 22.)

Watanabe does not disclose that the method comprises the steps of adding, as a response to a detected invalidity in a demultiplexed video data unit, an error indication to the demultiplexed video data signal. However, Lane discloses a method and

Art Unit: 2662

apparatus for performing packet synchronization recovery and error detection. Lane discloses that the apparatus comprise the step of detecting at demultiplexing a possible invalidity of a demultiplexed video data unit; and adding, as a response to a detected invalidity in a demultiplexed video data unit, an error indication to the demultiplexed video data signal (col. 7, lines 19-29, col. 8, lines 25-28, col.14, lines 1-6.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the method of adding an error indication to an error data packet disclosed by Lane into Watanabe system in order to save time to operate another function when an error packet is detected, because the system does not need to correct the error data packet.

Regarding claim 2, as best understood, Watanabe discloses that according to the error location, specific bits in the frame (header) are set (fig. 4A-5E, col. 9, line 18 - col. 10, line 14, col. 13, lines 14-39.)

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Watanabe does not disclose that the framing data blocks comprise an HDLC flag and/or PN (Pseudo random noise) flag. However, HDLC flag and PN flag are used in most of telecom system to detect an error data packet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply HDLC flag and/or PN flag to the system in order to adapt to the market, since both HDLC flag and PN flag method are applied in most of telecom equipment already.

Art Unit: 2662

Regarding claim 5, Watanabe discloses that the system can detect the error of the packet by checking the validity of the sequence number of the AL-PDU (fig. 37-49; col. 30, line 41- col. 33, line 63)

Regarding claim 6, the method disclosed by Watanabe inherently detects errors by checking illegal bit in a data packet, since Watanabe's method can detect and correct any error of the data packet (col. 2, line 55-col. 5. line 9.)

Regarding claim 7, Watanabe discloses that the method comprises the step of checking the length of a demultiplexed signal; and as a response to an invalid length, indicating the segmentation points of the concatenated packets (col. 4, lines 43-53.)

Regarding claim 8, the method disclosed by Watanabe comprises the step of detecting errors in the length of a demultiplexed video signal (col. 4, line 54 - col. 5 line 9).

Regarding claim 9, as best understood, the method disclosed by Watanabe inherently comprises the step of detecting missing segments (col. 13, lines 30-40; col. 18, lines 19-25; col. 20, lines 27-32; col. 21, lines 29-47.)

Regarding claim 10, the method disclosed by Watanabe comprises the step of detecting a shifted location of the starting point of a demultiplexed video signal (col. 4, lines 43-53.)

Regarding claim 11, as best understood, the method disclosed by Watanabe comprises the step of detecting comprising checking for corrupted segments (col. 4, lines 34-41.)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to the application:

US patent No. 5,483,287 A to Siracusa

US patent No. 5,467,342 A to Logston et al

US patent No. 6,356,567 B2 to Anderson et al

US patent No. 5,414,707 A to Johnston et al

US patent No. 5,487,061 A to Bray

US patent No. 6,034,968 A to Park et al

US patent No. 6,272,178 B1 to Nieweglowski et al

US patent No. 6,404,776 B1 to Voois et al

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai D Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 305-3232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (703) 305-4744. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314 for regular communications After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2662

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Thai Hoang D.
August 25, 2002



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600